UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,631	03/16/2004	Melissa Schneider	35041/400400	2630
27717 SEYFARTH SI	7590 10/24/200 HAW LLP		EXAMINER	
131 S. DEARBORN ST., SUITE 2400 CHICAGO, IL 60603-5803			GOODCHILD, WILLIAM J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2445	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/708,631	SCHNEIDER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILLIAM J. GOODCHILD	2445	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 A</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-6,8,10-22 and 29-34 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 10-22 and 29-34 is/are rejected to. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	ed. or election requirement.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed as a composition and accomposition and accomposition is accomposed as a composition and accomposition and accomposition are considered. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination.	cepted or b) objected to by the lead rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is objection.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat* * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/708,631 Page 2

Art Unit: 2445

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 10 objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 10 does not depend on a previous claim, yet the claim language states "as claimed in claim", the examiner will review claim 10 as if it is dependent on claim 1, it was previously dependent on claim 9. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-14, 20, 22, 29-30 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farahat et al., (US Publication No. 2005/0144067), (hereinafter Farahat), and further in view of Feldman et al., (US Publication No. 2004/0117654), (hereinafter Feldman).

Regarding claims 1 and 29, Farahat discloses providing a hypertext link to the second web site on the first web site [Farahat, paragraphs 3, 31 and 33];

transferring an Internet user to an intermediate web site [Farahat, paragraphs 53 and 58] after the Internet user clicks on the hypertext link on the first web site [Farahat, paragraph 40];

gathering information [Farahat, paragraphs 53, 56, 58 and 63] to determine if the first web site is found in the list of first web sites likely to send bad traffic [Farahat, paragraphs 53, 56, 58 and 63];

providing a validation request to the Internet user if the first web site is found in the list of first web sites likely to send bad traffic [Farahat, paragraphs 53, 56, 58 and 63]; and transferring the Internet user to the second web site if the first web site is not in the list of first web sites likely to send bad traffic [Farahat, paragraph 58].

Farahat does not specifically disclose providing a first web site database having a list of first web sites likely to send bad traffic; gathering information at the intermediate web site from the Internet user to determine if the first web site is found in the list of first web sites likely to send bad traffic. However, Feldman in the same field of endeavor discloses maintaining a listing of possible unusual behavior lists of registered users [Feldman, paragraphs 51, 34 and 47]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a list of possible unusual behavior in order to monitor and filter out bad traffic.

Feldman also discloses the addition of intermediate web pages [Feldman, paragraph 15]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an intermediate web site in order to provide a challenge to the possible bad traffic prior to allowing the bad traffic on the target web site.

Regarding claim 2, Farahat-Feldman further discloses wherein the first web site is an affiliate web site [Farahat, paragraph 33].

Regarding claim 3, Farahat-Feldman further discloses wherein the second web site is an advertiser web site [Farahat, paragraphs 33-34].

Regarding claim 4, Farahat-Feldman further discloses wherein the step of providing a hypertext link to the second web site includes receiving a keyword search from the Internet user, preparing a result list relevant to the keyword search, and providing at least one hypertext link on the first web site that is relevant to the keyword search [Farahat, paragraphs 33-34].

Regarding claim 5, Farahat-Feldman further discloses wherein the hypertext link includes an advertisement of the advertiser web site [Farahat, paragraphs 33-34].

Regarding claim 6, Farahat-Feldman further discloses wherein the intermediate web site includes a redirect page capable of determining if the validation request is required [Feldman, paragraphs 15 and 26].

Regarding claim 8, Farahat-Feldman further discloses compensating the first web site for causing the transmission of the second web site to the Internet user [Farahat, paragraphs 33-34].

Page 5

Regarding claim 10, Farahat-Feldman further discloses wherein the validation request includes providing a survey form with at least one input for the Internet user to input information [Farahat, paragraphs 53 and 58].

Regarding claim 11, Farahat-Feldman further discloses wherein the validation request includes collecting the input information into a survey database [Feldman, paragraphs 58 and 61-67].

Regarding claim 12, Farahat-Feldman further discloses wherein the validation request includes analyzing the input information in the survey database [Farahat, paragraph 58] to determine if the first web site should be listed in the first web site database [Feldman, paragraphs 46-49].

Regarding claim 13, Farahat-Feldman further discloses causing the transmission of the second web site to the Internet user [Farahat, paragraph 58].

Regarding claim 14, Farahat-Feldman further discloses compensating the first web site for causing the transmission of the second web site to the Internet user [Farahat, paragraphs 33-34].

Regarding claim 20, Farahat-Feldman further discloses determining if the web browser has cookies enabled [Feldman, paragraph 19];

determining a language of the web browser [Feldman, paragraph 48];

determining an amount of time that the Internet user spends on the advertiser web site [Feldman, paragraphs 45-49];

determining a total amount of times that the affiliate web site causes the transmission of the advertiser web site to the Internet user [Feldman, paragraphs 46-49]; and analyzing at least one of the web browser cookies, the language of the web browser, the amount of time the Internet user spends on the advertised website and the total amount of time the affiliate web site causes the transmission of the advertiser web site to the Internet user to determine if the affiliate web site is likely to send bad traffic [Feldman, paragraphs 15, 26 and 47-49]; and

adding the affiliate web site to a list of affiliate web sites likely to send bad traffic if the affiliate is determined as likely to send bad traffic [Farahat, paragraphs 34, 47 and 51], wherein a subsequent Internet user referred from the affiliate web site is required to respond to a validation request prior to the transmission of the advertiser web site to the subsequent Internet user [Feldman, paragraphs 53, 56, 58 and 63].

Regarding claim 22, Farahat-Feldman further discloses determining if the Internet user receives an incentive from the affiliate web site for clicking on the advertiser link [Farahat, paragraphs 33-34 and 53].

Regarding claim 30, Farahat-Feldman further discloses determining a total amount of times that the affiliate web site causes the transmission of the advertiser web site to the Internet user [Farahat, paragraph 14].

Regarding claim 32, Farahat-Feldman further discloses determining if the Internet user receives an incentive from the affiliate web site for clicking on the advertiser link [Farahat, paragraphs 33-34].

Regarding claim 33, Farahat-Feldman further discloses determining if the web browser has cookies enabled [Feldman, paragraph 19].

Regarding claim 34, Farahat-Feldman further discloses determining a language of the web browser [Feldman, paragraph 48].

4. Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farahat-Feldman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kirsch (US Publication No. 2005/0080856).

Regarding claim 15, Farahat-Feldman does not specifically disclose determining if a validation request is required includes randomly causing the validation request.

However, Kirsch discloses using a random sample [Kirsch, paragraph 78]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a random sample in order to test the validity of user access.

Regarding claim 16 Farahat-Feldman-Kirsch further discloses the validation request includes providing a survey page with at least one input for the Internet user to input information [Farahat, paragraphs 53 and 58].

Regarding claim 17 Farahat-Feldman-Kirsch further discloses the validation request includes collecting the input information into a survey database [Feldman, paragraph 46].

Regarding claim 18 Farahat-Feldman-Kirsch further discloses causing the transmission of the second web site to the Internet user [Farahat, paragraph 58].

Regarding claim 19 Farahat-Feldman-Kirsch further discloses compensating the first web site for causing the transmission of the second web site to the Internet user [Farahat, paragraphs 33-34].

5. Claims 21 and 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farahat-Feldman as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Bellare et al., (US Publication No. 2002/0069261), (hereinafter Bellare).

Regarding claims 21 and 31, Farahat-Feldman does not specifically disclose determining if the Internet user causes a mouse operably coupled to the Internet user web browser to move. However, Bellare discloses using a mouse for curser control on a display [Bellare, paragraph 27]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to monitor curser movement in order to determine if a user is accessing the web page or if it is automated.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8, 10-22 and 29-34 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular paragraphs / columns and line numbers in the reference(s) applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures

may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the cited passages as taught by the prior art or relied upon by the examiner.

Should applicant amend the claims of the claimed invention, it is respectfully requested that applicant clearly indicate the portion(s) of applicant's specification that support the amended claim language for ascertaining the metes and bounds of applicant's claimed invention

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM J. GOODCHILD whose telephone number is (571)270-1589. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday / 8:00 AM - 4:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/708,631 Page 11

Art Unit: 2445

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WJG 10/15/2008

> /Jason D Cardone/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2445